



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ever, less serious, scholars will do well, while they establish the new work in the place of the discarded Bruder, still to give the latter a place on the top shelf for occasional reference. Despite these defects, however, some of which may possibly be remedied in later editions, the book is a long-desired boon, for which every student of the Greek Testament ought to be devoutly grateful, and of a copy of which he should possess himself at the earliest moment. By the way, in view of the statements of the preface, would it be any more than justice that this book should be commonly known as Geden's Concordance?

ERNEST D. BURTON.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LEHRBUCH DER NEUTESTAMENTLICHEN THEOLOGIE. VON HEINRICH JULIUS HOLTZMANN, Doctor und ordentlichem Professor der Theologie in Strassburg. Freiburg und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897. 2 vols. Pp. xvi + 503, xi + 532, 8vo. M. 20.

THIS important and comprehensive work is laid out on a truly scientific plan. After a full account of the literature and a critical sketch of the history of the "Disciplin," the writer, setting out from the point of view that the New Testament cannot be understood apart from the ideas of the Jewish canonical books and the later Judaism, its theology, angelology, demonology, and eschatology, gives a condensed review of this vast field. To the documents for the theology of the synagogue is accorded only a relative and secondary value on account of their later date. On the ground, however, that these writings record ancient traditions, the rule is laid down that when thoughts and expressions in the New Testament have a striking analogy to others in the Talmud and Midrash, these may be regarded as forms of the Jewish theology existing in New Testament times. The later apocryphal and apocalyptic literature of Judaism furnishes striking parallels to the New Testament ideas as to angels and demons, and in particular as to Satan, sin, and the fall of man (Luke 22:31; 2 Cor. 11:3, etc.). The occurrence of the same ideas in this literature and in that of the synagogue lends probative force to the latter. The Messianic doctrines of these writings throw light upon the cruder Messianism of the New Testament, especially that of its apocalyptic portions. Passages in 4 Ezra and Baruch may be compared with Matt. 24:7 and Mark 13:12. Deliverance from sin, however, through attachment in faith to the person of the Messiah, as taught by Paul, is foreign to Jewish thought. A

long section on the Alexandrian theology completes the extended discussion of the ideas of contemporary Judaism, occupying about one hundred pages, and brings us to the teaching of Jesus.

Of Jesus himself Dr. Holtzmann affirms that no real course of development can be proved. Certain conditions and impressions, however, which must have influenced him are recorded in his discourses—physical nature and environment, the spiritual atmosphere of the Old Testament, contemporary society, the Judaism of the synagogue and of the law, and John the Baptist. Reference is unnecessary to the many passages which show the influence upon the form of his teaching exerted by the climatic and social surroundings. A few will suffice (Matt. 6: 26; 13: 32; 15: 26, 27; Mark 4: 21; Luke 11: 7; 14: 7; 17: 35; 20: 46, 47; 21: 1). His words show a reading acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures and also with the uncanonical literature of his people, from the latter of which he quotes in Luke 11: 40. By Greek ideas he was as little influenced as by rabbinical theology, and from Essenian traits in Matthew it is not to be concluded that he belonged to that order. In the baptism of John Jesus “received the last of the incitements which are demonstrable before his public appearance,” whatever significance may be attached to the facts that his ministry opened with John’s call to repentance, and that like the latter he gathered disciples about him. We must not omit, however, to take into account his own religious genius, which enabled him to assume an attitude of superiority and refusal toward many ideas of his time; his faith in God, which was “not born of the storms of doubt;” his divine gift of love, and his mighty strength of will. “The religious genius lives rather from looking into himself than about himself.” To those acquainted with the author’s *Einleitung* it is necessary only to indicate briefly his position on the difficult problem of the sources of the teaching of Jesus. All that lies outside the three synoptics is regarded as of secondary importance. In the first rank are the logia of Matthew, the original Mark-writing, and “a still ever problematical separate source of the author *ad Theophilum*.” “Our present gospels are books of devotion, and their relation to their historical contents is very complicated.” Resch may take this crumb of comfort: “Despite all excesses, there remains a right kernel in the attempted proof of inner and outer canonical translation-variants.”

In treating the difficult question of Jesus’ relation to the law the author is inclined to exclude passages in Matt., chap. 5. He favors connecting 5: 20–48 with 5: 17, ascribing the latter verse, however, to

Matthew, in which case verse 18 "cannot be a genuine logion." All attempts to bring 5:18 into accord with 5:20-48 "issue in the desperate endeavor to make Jesus say the opposite of the unmistakable sense of his words." If Matt. 5:18 be retained and fairly interpreted only one possibility remains: "One must simply recognize the contradiction in Jesus' consciousness as the shadow which the religious genius cast and could not but cast." But since a strong Judaizing tendency is recognized in the first gospel, and Matt. 5:17 is ascribed to the evangelist, *καταλύνει τὸν νόμον* and *πληροῦν τ. ν.* being credited to the Pauline terminology, might not one hazard the conjecture that the true connection of the teaching of Jesus appears in joining 5:20 ff. with 5:16?

With regard to the idea of God as King and Father, Dr. Holtzmann holds with Dr. Weiss that Jesus stood upon Old Testament ground. Even the name "Father" is no discovery of his. God's fatherhood does not, however, rest upon the fact of creation. It is the "new family" (Mark 3:34, 35), the disciples, who are bidden to address God as Father. They are sons of God, since by anticipation they are members of his kingdom. They are "called" or "become" children of God who make peace, love their enemies, bless those who curse them, etc. (Matt. 5:9, 44, 45). The earlier idea of God is, however, enlarged and "furnished with a universalistic perspective." "God is Father of all who will become his children." This necessarily belongs with the thought of the kingdom of God.

The apparent antinomy in Jesus' representation of the kingdom of God as both present and to come, as destined to have an age-long development and yet a sudden, apocalyptic establishment, finds at our author's hands a historical solution from the point of view that Jesus had one conception of the kingdom in the time of his success and triumph and another when he was engaged in conflict and saw defeat at hand. This resolution of the antinomy, the opposing members of which are about equally well supported by exegesis, has in its favor an analogy with Jesus' conception of his Messiahship. For the Jesus of the synoptics as the Son of Man is conceived in relation to the future kingdom in accordance with the Daniel apocalypse. In the Son of Man of that book he sees prefigured his own Messiahship. If we put the apocalyptic portions of the synoptics to the credit of the evangelists, or with Arnold Meyer, Lietzmann, and others regard the term Son of Man as an Aramaic expression for Man, the facts remain that the title is applied to Jesus in exalted as well as in lowly functions, in pas-

sages which have no apocalyptic sense (Mark 8: 31; 9: 31, with reference to death and resurrection), and in general where he announces, extends, and represents the kingdom of God as one forgiving, healing, teaching, and suffering. Regarding the attempt to make it appear that Jesus made no claim to the Messiahship, Dr. Holtzmann remarks that "He who, taking his departure from the thought of the kingdom, knew himself to be its chosen organ, found, proceeding from the idea of God, the complementary counterpart to this idea in his own consciousness of Sonship; and these two, the Son of Man and the Son of God, were united in his consciousness of Messiahship." He also finds it impossible to understand "under what other flag" than this of Messiahship "the life-ship of Jesus should sail."

The interpretation of the synoptic eschatology corresponds with that of the kingdom of God and Messianism. The former "has no other content than the prophesied triumph of the Messiah." Jesus foretold not only his death, but also his resurrection. But the record shows, in the scattering of the disciples, the embalming of the body, the stone before the tomb, and the astonishment at the open grave, that he had said nothing of rising within three days. If, moreover, he foretold his "personal restitution, and indeed probably just in the form of the resurrection," he must have had in view also the completion of his kingdom, and hence the prophecy included his triumphant return for this purpose. He told his disciples, or at least his judges, that they would see him sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven (Mark 14: 62). The immediate future, the existing generation, would witness this event. The kernel of this prophecy belongs to Jesus, and is not to be credited to the evangelists, to whatever degree the form and embellishment may be theirs. It is worthy of note here that Dr. Holtzmann abandons the position on this point defended in *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863.

The sources of the Pauline theology do not include Second Thessalonians and the pastoral epistles, and admit as of only secondary importance Colossians and Ephesians. The materials of the Pauline doctrine relating to God and the world, revelation, inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures, Messiah, Satan, angels, demons, etc., came from the scholastic theology of the Jews. More than an "incidental" contribution was also furnished by Hellenism. In the Pauline anthropology "the outer man" includes *σάρξ* as the material and *σῶμα* as the form, and *ψυχή* is inseparably joined with the *σάρξ* as its life-energy which perishes with it; while to "the inner man" belong *νοῦς* (the reason, thought,

and a will opposed to the animal man), and conscience (*συνείδησις*). The doctrines of sin, Christology, and salvation rest upon a distinct exclusion of *σάρξ* from the inner man. The author differs with Lüdemann, Wendt, Pfeiderer, and many other eminent scholars, in holding that Paul does not ascribe a *πνεῦμα* to man as an attribute belonging to him essentially and apart from his Christian renewal. Rather *πνεῦμα* = *πνεῦμα θεῶν*—a somewhat hazardous position, the exegetical support of which is not as strong as that drawn from the analogy of the apostle's thought. A Hellenistic dualism is found in the opposition of *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*, and it is maintained that Paul conceived of *πνεῦμα* as a "finer materiality," a "higher light-substance," of which the "spiritual body" was believed to be composed. The two factors of sin are the law, which was given that it might "abound," and the flesh, a power hostile to the Spirit and to God. Paul leaves the ground of the Jewish *Weltanschauung* and ethics, and stands opposed to our modern ideas in connecting sin inseparably with the substance of man's bodily organism in which it resides indissolubly as a "power" (Rom. 7:18). He knows nothing, however, of a matter evil in itself, so that his dualism is ethical rather than metaphysical. An unresolved difficulty appears in the relation of personal sinning to the primal sin, since in Rom. 5:12-19 a transference of the original sin to Adam's posterity appears to be taught, while in 7:14-23 and in 1 Cor. 15:45-47 sin is represented as having its ground in the nature of man, which Paul nowhere teaches to have undergone a change by reason of the first transgression. Dr. Holtzmann thinks that no reconciliation of these two teachings is adequate to resolve the antinomy implied in the entrance of death into the world through the first transgression (Rom. 5:12) and its inherence in the flesh, which in its nature partakes of corruption (*φθορά*). The death which is "the wages of sin" is not only that of the body, but also "destruction," annihilation, "exclusion from the sphere of existence."

The negative and pessimistic aspects of the doctrine of sin are relieved by the Christology, which presents an adequate Saviour in the preëxistent heavenly man who was "in the form of God," and through whom all things were made. The "was made" (*ἐγένετο*) in 1 Cor. 15:45, "the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit," is interpreted in the sense "became," that is, as representing a process completed in the resurrection, in consequence of which Christ was "declared to be the Son of God, with power" (Rom. 1:4). Raised from the dead, he assumed the spiritual form of being (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*) in which he had

previously existed. By "he was buried" (1 Cor. 15:4) is meant that with his flesh disappeared all that was national and legal in his Messiahship. The resurrection of his body would contradict not only 1 Cor. 15:37, 50, but the entire spirit of Paulinism, according to which "the grave signifies the death of the national-religious, the resurrection the sole validity of the universal, Messiah-ideal." The identity of the preëxistent with the postexistent Christ is maintained. To Paul Jesus was a human being, the ideal Man, in his preëxistent state, and the unity of his heavenly and earthly existence is indicated in the personal-official designation, "Jesus Christ," applied to him in both spheres. The end of the mission of Christ was the salvation of men by his death on the cross as a sacrifice for sin in accordance with the idea of the Jewish theology that the penalty of the sins of one might be borne by another. The reconciliation effected was not only that of man with God, but also that of God with man through the blood of Christ shed as a propitiation (Rom. 3:25). The resurrection of the believer to "newness of life" (Rom. 6:4) represents the ethical side of atonement, the mystic personal union with Christ. The atonement is effective only for those who believe. It is appropriated by faith, which is "an energy of the will manifesting itself in unreserved trust" (Rom. 4:19, 20). The righteousness which could not be attained under the law is a "gift" (Rom. 5:17) "on account of faith," which is reckoned as righteousness, so that "he who is not in himself righteous is regarded and declared by God to be so." The righteousness thus "imputed" in the *sensus forensis* is that of God (*θεοῦ*), which He may "declare," not as a Judge, who cannot pronounce a guilty man innocent, but as a King having a right to pardon. The author finds the ethical aspect of salvation in Rom. 5:17, according to which "man must constitute the battlefield of the sensuous desires of the flesh and of the will directed to God to the end that in general the human will may not finally come to a realization of its own contents." Predestination inheres in the Pauline ethics.

In discussing Paul's eschatology the author follows Pfeiderer in the opinion that the apostle simply reproduces the ideas of the primitive Jewish-Christian community, so far as the limited perspective is concerned—the day of the Lord coming "as a thief in the night" and the believers, including himself, living to see the end (1 Thess. 5:2, 14, 15, 17; 1 Cor. 1:7, 8; 11:26; 15:51). Christ comes forth from the heavens with a retinue of angels and the sound of a trumpet, the Christian dead are raised, and the believers who are alive are "changed."

A change in the apostle's eschatology is assumed to have taken place within the ten years between the first and the last of his authentic epistles, probably between First and Second Corinthians. In the latter he appears to believe in an immediate investment with the spiritual body at death. The author differs, however, with Schmiedel in assuming that Paul had in mind here only "an exceptional case" affecting "himself and some companions in spirit and destiny;" but he gives no other reason for the opinion than that otherwise we must assume "a complete transformation of the apostle's eschatology." The "spiritual" aspect of the eschatology is summed up in the remark that negatively it did away with the resurrection of the flesh, to which death indissolubly clings, and positively limited the resurrection to believers. An "interregnum" of Christ is assumed between his coming and "the end," an indefinite period (*ἡμέρα χριστοῦ*), during which further conquest may be won from Death in a third *πάγμα* (1 Cor. 15: 23).

We can only glance at the extended treatment of the deutero-Pauline literature. The author's opinions on Colossians and Ephesians are well known to readers of his *Einleitung* and his *Kritik der Eph.- und Kol.-briefe*. The doctrinal contents common to the two epistles are discussed under several heads—Judaism, heathenism, and Christianity; faith and works; Christianity as theosophy; angelology; and the *πλήρωμα*. The ideas predominant in Colossians are Christological, and their difference from the Pauline Christology of the four great epistles is pointed out. The doctrines especially represented in Ephesians relate to predestination and the church. The pastoral epistles are regarded as showing their unauthenticity by a relatively meager equipment in general and their post-Pauline origin even more distinctly than Ephesians and Colossians by "a flattening of the Pauline thought according to the standard of the understanding of a later time." The points of view of these epistles are discussed under eighteen separate heads. Hebrews is shown to present important departures from Paulinism. As Paul knows nothing of Christ as "the Apostle and High Priest of our confession" (Heb. 3: 1), so Hebrews nothing of the second Adam. The exaltation of Christ to the rank of a "God-being" exceeds the utmost reach of the Pauline Christology. In Paul the emphasis rests on the death and resurrection of Christ, while in Hebrews the latter is merely mentioned, and "the second act completing the atoning death is transferred to heaven." Instead of "justification" we have here "cleansing" and "sanctifying."

The catholic epistles, First and Second Peter, James, and Jude, are



regarded as standing "at the farthest remove from primitive Christianity and the questions which agitated it." Of all these First Peter is the most distinctively deutero-Pauline. But it contains nothing primitive-apostolic. "It is, however, perhaps, a document of primitive Christianity in the sense in which Paulinism itself belongs thereto." The preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison (3:19) is regarded as one of the "didactic specialties" of the epistle which are attached to Pauline premises, with reference to Eph. 4:8-10. The reference in 2 Peter 3:15, 16 to Paul's epistles which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction is intelligible only if by it the opposition of Paulinism to primitive-apostolic Christianity, so far as it was remembered by a later generation, was referred to a false interpretation of the apostle's letters and to their obscurities. The epistle of James furnishes little of doctrinal interest, and the discussion of it is concerned chiefly with the relation of its contents to Paulinism. In its field of view and means of expression it belongs to the Hellenistic literature from which it has largely drawn. Spitta's opinion that the epistle was written at an early date by a non-Christian writer is rejected, and it is regarded as one of the latest of the canonical books which could not have been written prior to Paul, since 2:14-26 is directed against his doctrine of faith. On this point the author says: "The efforts to obscure so manifest a situation, to show that both writers either mean the same thing or at least take no opposed standpoints, but agree in some higher unity, form a by no means pleasing or honorable chapter of Protestant biblical science." If the writer of James did not correctly apprehend the Pauline doctrine and missed it in his polemic, it does not follow from this "that he did not intend to hit it."

The Johannine theology is subjected to an analytical treatment of great extent and thoroughness. The scientific point of view requires that the fourth gospel be regarded primarily as "a didactic writing," to the leading ideas of which the Johannine epistles furnish certain amplifications. "The admission of some synoptic material and sayings does not alter the fact that in evident contrast with the historical portrait of Jesus his entire earthly work is referred to supersensible and eternal conditions." The discourses of Jesus are so constructed that "in contrast with the sententious catchwords of the synoptics they become connected monologues." "These two concessions are now generally made by apologists: that this history is somehow an ideal history and that these discourses must somehow be subjective

creations of the evangelist—in a word, that here we are farther than elsewhere from a photograph of the reality.” The relation of the Johannine thought to that of Paul is elucidated in detail. “Paulinism in its impelling thought, freedom of faith from the law, and in its ultimate goal, salvation for all, forms a ferment of the Johannine theology.” The author does not agree with B. Weiss that in John is to be found even a developed form of primitive-apostolic Christianity. To the conception of the Logos “an essentially Philonian stamp cannot be denied.” “The idea of the Logos has its origin primarily in the need of a mediation of the abstract conception of God with the world.” Preëxistence is ascribed to Christ (3:13; 6:62) apart from the prologue—“an idea wholly foreign to the synoptical Jesus.” The synoptics are surpassed also in the ascription of omniscience and omnipotence to Jesus (4:16-18; 6:61, 64; 10:28-30; 13:19; 16:19; 17:2). The Johannine anthropology is regarded as based upon the dualism of *σάρξ* and *πνεῦμα*. The fourth gospel, however, recognizes no natural transition from the one sphere into the other, “although the whole primitive-Christian programme, the call to repentance by Jesus and the apostles, rests upon the presupposition of the possibility of such a transition.” He who has passed from the one realm into the other has been “born from above” (3:3, 5), *i. e.*, has become the subject of a miracle. The Johannine formula for the synoptic *μετάνοια* is *ἡ ἀνοθεν γέννησις* or *ἀναγέννησις*. The atoning, propitiatory sacrifice of Christ in the Pauline sense has no representation in the fourth gospel. Rather “his saving work, according to the gnosticizing programme of the prologue, consists in his own self-revelation.” Here, however, as in Hebrews, the Pauline theory of propitiation “lies in the background,” and there are “presuppositions for a valuation of the death of Christ which approach and presuppose the Pauline.” In like manner the Pauline doctrine of faith is emptied of its essential contents. In the eschatology the apocalyptic, synoptic, and Pauline features disappear, and “all blessedness consists in the permanent possession of the fellowship with Christ” (15:11, 15; 16:14, 15, 33).

We have not space to present a summary of the fruitful discussion under the head of “The Theological Problems of Primitive Christianity,” which occupies 150 pages of the work, and which includes such topics as “The Beginnings of the Christology” and of “Dogmatizing on the Death of the Messiah,” “Preëxistence,” “Supernatural Birth,” “Matthew, Mark, and Luke,” with reference to their attitude toward the “problems,” “the New Testament and the Catholic Church,”

"Gnosis," "Canon," and "Church." A review of such a work within admissible limits can do no more than present the leading positions of the author in a lucid summary. It has been the object of this notice to do this without presuming to enter upon detailed criticisms of the work of so accomplished a master as Dr. Holtzmann. The volumes will well repay a careful examination by students of New Testament theology. The work may fitly crown the long series of the author's labors upon the New Testament. Its comprehensive and sure grasp of the whole subject, its impartial consideration of the vast literature, its logical arrangement of the material, and its acute and masterful exegesis entitle it to a very high rank. It is no slight merit that the opinions of other scholars in the field which it covers are quoted, analyzed, and discussed. The views of the most distinguished of the author's opponents, and even of young writers among them, receive this consideration, and, while he is not more decided than we could wish him to be in the expression of his own conclusions, those who differ with him are treated with fine courtesy. These qualities combine to constitute a work of which it is not hazardous to prophesy that it will in the future rank as a classic in its department.

ORELLO CONE.

BOSTON, MASS.

DER ERSTE BRIEF AN DIE CORINTHER, neu bearbeitet von DR. C. F. GEORG HEINRICI, K. Pr. Consistorialrath und Professor der Theologie an der Universität Leipzig. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896. Pp. x + 530, 8vo. M. 7.

THIS third edition of Dr. Heinrici's redaction of Meyer's 1 Corinthians (the eighth edition in the Meyer series) well realizes the purpose of the publishers to preserve "the historical peculiarity of the old Meyer—the character of a repertory." A service is rendered to exegesis by this editing of the celebrated commentary by other hands, whereby account is taken of the conclusions of recent scholars, although the peril is not always escaped of disguising the great exegete in the new habiliments. The editor is well and favorably known by his commentary in two volumes on the Corinthian epistles (1880, 1887), in which the relation of primitive Christianity to Hellenism was especially considered. In the volume before us he claims to have furnished fresh evidences of the "Hellenistic woof" in the two epistles as well as of their relations to "rabbinical theologumena."